

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/707,355
Docket No.: 9612-US-PA

To the Drawings:

FIG. 1 has been amended to include the light guider 140, which is fully supported in Paragraph [0021], and is attached herein in the form of "Replacement Sheet".

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/707,355
Docket No.: 9612-US-PA

REMARKS

Present Status of the Application

The Office Action objected to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a) for not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims, and for not showing a light guider as recited in Claim 10. The appropriate traversals and corrections are made to FIG. 1 for overcoming the above objections.

The title is objected to due to minor informalities. As a result, the brackets surrounding the title are removed in the aforementioned section "IN THE TITLE" to obviate the objection to the title.

Claims 8, 9, 17, and 19 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim.

Claims 2, 6, and 14 are further objected to because of several informalities.

Claims 1-5 and 10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yamazaki et al. (US-6,424,326, hereinafter "Yamazaki").

Claims 6-9 and 14-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki et al. (US-6,424,326, hereinafter "Yamazaki") in view of Heeger et al. (US-5,504,323, hereinafter "Heeger").

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections and amend the claims addressed to Claims 1-20 for at least the reasons set forth below.

Discussion of the objections to the drawings

The Office Action objected to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a) for not showing features relating to the red-light pixels, the green-light pixels, and the blue-light pixels in

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/707,355
Docket No.: 9612-US-PA

the proper drawings, and for not showing a light guider as recited in Claim 10.

In response to the objections to the drawings referred to in Item 1 on Page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1 and 13 have been amended to change "the red-light pixels", "the green-light pixels", and "the blue-light pixels" all in plural to be "a red-light pixel", "the a green-light pixel", and "a blue-light pixel" all in singular form. The above claim amendments are fully supported in FIG. 1 in which a one to one corresponding relationship is clearly shown between 110a & 111a, between 110b & 111b, and between 110c & 111c. Furthermore, support for the above claim amendments in claims 1 & 13 are also found in Paragraph [0018] of the present invention: "The red-light detector 111a is adjacent to the red-light pixel 110a on the transparent substrate 100, i.e., within red-light area 101a. The green-light detector 111b is adjacent to the green-light pixel 110b on the transparent substrate 100, i.e., within the green-light area 101b. The blue-light detector 111c is adjacent to the blue-light pixel 110c on the transparent substrate 100, i.e., within the blue-light area 101c." 110a, 110b, 110c are clearly all in singular form in Paragraph [0018].

As a result of the above claim amendments to claims 1 & 13, the objections to the drawings in Item 1 of the Office Action is moot, and should be withdrawn.

Furthermore, Paragraphs [0007] & [0009] are also amended to be consistent with the rest of the description of the present invention as in FIG. 1 and Paragraph [0018] traversed above; therefore, no new matter is introduced.

In response to Item 2 on Page 2 of the Office Action, a light guider as recited in claim 10 is shown in the amended FIG. 1 as element 140. In addition, Paragraph [0021] has also been amended to reflect the above naming of the light guider as element 140. Since the

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/707,355
Docket No.: 9612-US-PA

light guider is fully supported in claim 10 and in Paragraph [0021]; therefore, no new matter is introduced.

As a result, the objection to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a) described in Item 2 on Page 2 of the Action should be withdrawn.

Discussion of the objections to the Specification

In response to the objection of the title of the application to include brackets, the brackets are deleted as reflected in the aforementioned section **"IN THE TITLE"**. Therefore, the above objection should be withdrawn.

Discussion of the objections to the claims

In response to the claim objections in Item 4 on Page 3 of the Office Action alleging that claims 8, 9, 17, and 19 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim, claims 8, 9, 17, and 19 have been amended and new claims 21, 22, 23, and 24 have been added for overcoming the aforementioned claim objections. The amendments to claims 8, 9, 17, and 19 and the additions of new claims 21-24 are fully supported in the original claims 8, 9, 17, and 19. No new matter is introduced.

As a result of the aforementioned claim amendments, the above claim objections should be withdrawn.

In response to Item 5 on Pages 3-4 of the Office Action, the appropriate corrections have been made to overcome the respective claim objections to claims 2, 6, and 14. As a result, the aforementioned claim objections should be withdrawn.

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/707,355
Docket No.: 9612-US-PA

Discussion of the claim rejections under 35 USC 102(b)

The Office Action has rejected Claims 1-5 and 10-13 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yamazaki et al. (US-6,424,326, hereinafter "Yamazaki").

In regards to claim 1, the following claim limitations in the amended claim 1: "a red-light detector disposed adjacent to a red-light pixel on the transparent substrate", "a green-light detector disposed adjacent to a green-light pixel on the transparent substrate", and "a blue-light detector disposed adjacent to a blue-light pixel on the transparent substrate" are patentable over Yamazaki. Contrary to the assertion by the Examiner, the red-light detector 104a in Yamazaki is not disposed "adjacent" to the red-light pixels 105, as further described in col. 14, lines 6-9, and shown in FIGs. 1 and 2 in Yamazaki.

In regards to claim 5, the elements "aluminum, aluminum/lithium fluorine, calcium" and "silver" in claim 5 are patentable over Yamazaki because contrary to the assertion by the Examiner in the Office Action on Page 5, none of the aforementioned elements are taught in Yamazaki.

In regards to claim 11, the following claim limitations: "a driving unit coupled to each of the pixels, and each of the red-light detector, the green-light detector and the blue-light detector coupled to transfer units" in claim 11 are patentable over Yamazaki. In Col. 5, lines 33-35 and Col. 6, line 24 of Yamazaki, Yamazaki clearly defines 104a to 104c to be the sensor pixels 104. Furthermore, 130, 131, 134, and 135 are clearly defined as elements within the sensor pixel 104 as shown in FIG. 3 in Yamazaki. In addition, it can be seen that 104a is equivalent to a red-light detector, 104b is equivalent to a green-

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/707,355
Docket No.: 9612-US-PA

light detector, and 104c is equivalent to a blue-light detector. And since each of the 104a, 104b, and 104c is coupled to the transfer units as described in the aforementioned claim limitations, 134 and 135 then **cannot be** the transfer units as alleged by the Examiner because 134 and 135 **are instead part of** 104a, 104b, and 104c as shown in FIG. 3 in Yamazaki. On the other hand, in the present invention, the driving unit is clearly defined to be external of the element 104 as shown in FIG. 1 of the present invention. The Examiner had implicitly described in the Office Action that the driving unit (130, 131) is part of 104 (as shown by the dashed lines) in FIG. 3 in Yamazaki. Therefore, the driving unit in the present invention is clearly not taught in Yamazaki, and the above claim limitations are patentable over Yamazaki.

In regards to claim 13, the following claim limitations in amended claim 13:

“forming a red-light detector **adjacent to** a red-light pixel on the transparent substrate;

forming a green-light detector **adjacent to** a green-light pixel on the transparent substrate; and

forming a blue-light detector **adjacent to** a blue-light pixel on the transparent substrate.” are clearly patentable over Yamazaki based upon the same argument for traversal as presented for claim 1 above.

Based upon the aforementioned traversing, pending the allowance of independent claim 1, dependent claims 2-5 and 10-12 should also be patentable over Yamazaki, and should be allowed as a result.

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/707,355
Docket No.: 9612-US-PA

Discussion of the claim rejections under 35 USC 103(a)

The Office Action has rejected Claims 6-9 and 14-20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki et al. (US-6,424,326, hereinafter "Yamazaki") in view of Heeger et al. (US-5,504,323, hereinafter "Heeger").

In regards to dependent claims 6 – 9, pending the allowance of independent claim 1 and that neither Yamazaki nor Heeger teaches of a red-light detector, a green-light detector, and a blue-light detector to be disposed adjacent to a red-light pixel, a green-light pixel, and a blue-light pixel, respectively, on a transparent substrate; therefore, claims 6 – 9 are also patentable over Yamazaki and Heeger, and should be allowed.

In regards to dependent claims 14-20, pending the allowance of independent claim 13 and that neither Yamazaki nor Heeger teaches of forming a red-light detector, a green-light detector, and a blue-light detector adjacent to a red-light pixel, a green-light pixel, and a blue-light pixel, respectively, on the transparent substrate; therefore, claims 14-20 are also patentable over Yamazaki and Heeger, and should be allowed.

In regards to claim 20, the elements "aluminum, aluminum/lithium fluoride, calcium" and "silver" in claim 20 are patentable over Yamazaki and Heeger because contrary to the assertion by the Examiner in the Office Action on Page 7, none of the aforementioned elements are taught in Yamazaki or Heeger.

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/707,355
Docket No.: 9612-US-PA

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that all the pending claims 1-24 of the present application patently define over the prior art and are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Date: *March 6, 2006*

Jianq Chyun Intellectual Property Office
7th Floor-I, No. 100
Roosevelt Road, Section 2
Taipei, 100
Taiwan
Tel: 011-886-2-2369-2800
Fax: 011-886-2-2369-7233
Email: belinda@jcipgroup.com.tw
Usa@jcipgroup.com.tw

Respectfully submitted,

Belinda Lee
Belinda Lee

Registration No.: 46,863

BEST AVAILABLE COPY